



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/473,598	12/29/1999	RAYMOND C. EDMONDS	042390.P7353	1187

7590 02/18/2004

JOHN F TRAVIS
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

ABDULSELAM, ABBAS I

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2674

DATE MAILED: 02/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/473,598

Applicant(s)

RAYMOND C. EDMONDS

Examiner

Abbas I Abdulsalam

Art Unit

2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5,10-13,15-22,24,26 and 27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5,10-13,15-22,24,26 and 27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 01/29/04 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1-3, 5, 10-13, 15-22, 24 and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salesky et al. (USPN 6343311) in view of Ohshima (USPN 5977945) and Ahmed et al. (USPN 6647432).

Regarding claims 1 and 22, Salesky teaches a conferencing system (10) including presenter client computer (12) and three attendee clients (18) that are connected through a conference server (14) and data network (16). See col. 6, lines 66-67, col. 7, lines 1-10 & Fig. 1. Salesky teaches graphic drawing commands updating a specific region of the image, and discloses a comparison whose result ignores unchanged portions of the captured image and

Art Unit: 2674

transmits only changed ones See col. 12, lines 1-16, 34-44 & Fig. 4A. For example, if a block “B6” is the block being sent, block “B6” of the current copy of the captured image 69(a) is compared with block “B6” of the most recently stored reference copy 69(b) of the capture mage. If the result shows B6 has changed, it will be transmitted. If not, it will not be transmitted. See col. 12, lines 34-49, Fig. 4A, and Fig. 4B. Furthermore, Salesky discloses that a block is sent to the stored image allowing the stored image to be updated at the same time the changes are sent to the server. See col. 12, lines 63-67 & Fig. 4D. However, Salesky does not disclose updating the first video memory with the first portion and updating the second video memory with the second portion. Ohshima on the other hand teaches a partial rewritten library (32) functioning in response to the partially rewritten line determination means (16). See col. 3, lines 26-31.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Salesky’s client-server system (Fig. 1) to adapt Ohshima’s partially written line determination means (10). One would have been motivated in view of the suggestion in Ohshima that the partially written line determination means equivalently provides the desired updating of the first and second video memories. The use of partially written line determination means helps function client-server system as taught by Ohshima.

Salesky does not teach transmission over a bus to a first video memory contained within a first display device, and likewise transmission over the bus to a second video memory contained within a second display device. Ahmed on the other hand teaches a first workstation (24) that is interconnected to a second workstation (26), the first workstation including a processor (24a) connected to a system bus (24d), a display (24b) connected to the system bus (24d), and a memory (24c) connected to system bus (24d). Similarly, Ahmed teaches that the

Art Unit: 2674

second workstation (26) includes a processor (26a) connected to a system bus (26d), a display (26b) connected to a system bus (26d), and a memory (26c) connected to a system bus (26d). See Fig. 3.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Salesky's client-server system to adapt Ahmed's "first client" and "second client" along with their respective execution techniques as shown in Fig. 3. One would have been motivated in view of the suggestion in Ahmed that executions of Fig. 3 including the use of bus-display [(24b, 24d), (26d, 26b)] for client 1 and client 2 respectively, equivalently provide transmissions over a bus to a first and second memory contained within the first and second displays respectively. The use of executing two client models helps establish client non-server system as taught by Ahmed.

In regard to claim 22, in addition to what has been described above, Salesky discloses three conferee clients (17a, 17b, 17c) each using different protocol in their respective network connections. See Fig. 11 and col. 30, lines 3-14.

Regarding claim 2, Ohshima discloses X client (30) with respect to X server (31) to determine the line to which partial writing should be applied and transfers such information to the remote firmware (35). See Fig. 3, lines 22-28.

Regarding claims 3 and 5, Salesky teaches flow control between presenter client (12) and server (14) and between server (14) and attendee client (18) determining how often the attendee client receives information updating the image. See col. 8, lines 3-10. It would have been obvious the presenter client can decide the transmission to take place at any interval including irregular interval.

Art Unit: 2674

Regarding claim 10, Salesky teaches that the presenter client sends out a stream or streams, which can vary in format. See col. 14, lines 45-46.

Regarding claim 11, Salesky teaches that the presenter client can dynamically change the format in which it provides the data. See col. 19, lines 15-27. It would have been obvious that the presenter client can do a uniform format.

Regarding claims 12 and 24, Salesky teaches the presenter client software along with attendee client software in connection with the server relaying the information to all the attendee client computers and transforming the data as required. It would have been obvious that the presenter client software identifies the attendees including their addresses. See col. 7, lines 21-33.

Regarding claim 13, Salesky discloses the presenter client that identifies where the block is in the capture rectangle with block-location ID stamp, and identifies the time with a time-stamp. Salesky also teaches synchronization in the system through conference server (14), which issues time synchronization signals. See col. 7, lines 57-65.

Regarding claim 15, Salesky teaches CSS 40(a) providing an included “gateway” layer 40(b) for each connection protocol other than the system protocol and this layer translates the client’s non-system protocol to the system protocol. See col. 30, lines 3-14.

Regarding claims 18-19, Ohshima teaches the use of a display controller (36) and a graphic controller (27) with executable software (44). See col. 3, lines 62-67 and col. 4, lines 1-6.

Art Unit: 2674

Regarding claims 16-17, Salesky teaches the use of time stamps, and discloses synchronizer (130), which uses arbitration technique to maintain consistency between client time stamps and server receipt time stamps. See col. 20, lines 32-37.

Regarding claim 26, Salesky teaches the use of all types of data streams as well as the use of non-visual transmissions such as audio within the network. See col. 3, lines 42-51.

Regarding claim 27, Salesky teaches the use of coder-decoder (codec) facilitating for the compression and decompression of images. See col. 3, lines 24-30.

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following arts are cited for further reference.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,681,001 to Clayton et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,643,697 to Eve et al.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to **Abbas Abdulsalam** whose telephone number is **(703) 305-8591**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday (9:00-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Richard Hjerpe**, can be reached at **(703) 305-4709**.

Art Unit: 2674

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology center 2600 customer Service office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Abbas Abdulsalam

Examiner

Art Unit 2674

February 16, 2004


XIAO WU
PRIMARY EXAMINER